

## REMARKS

There remains pending in this application claims 8-11, of which claim 8 is independent. No claims have been added or cancelled.

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, and more specifically, for the claimed driving unit. In addition, claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement on grounds that the specification does not provide a written description of the driving unit employed for separating the pair of reverse-discharge rollers from each other. In view of the above amendments and reasons which follow, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 8, as well as claim 11 depending therefrom, has been amended to eliminate reference to a driving unit and to instead recite a solenoid for contacting and separating the pair of reverse-discharge rollers from each other. Support for the solenoid to perform this function can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 21-25. Thus there is proper written description and antecedent basis for this claimed feature of Applicants' invention. Applicants have also added language positively reciting that the solenoid separates the pair of reverse-discharge rollers from each other during a start of the original document reading process. Again, this feature of the solenoid is expressly disclosed and taught in the specification at page 11, lines 6-8.

Applicants have also amended claim 11 to eliminate its reference to a driving unit and to replace that recitation with reference to a solenoid. In the Official Action of December 2, 2004, the Examiner had rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

second paragraph, on grounds that there does not appear to be a means to detect the rear end of the original document. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the specification at least on page 11, lines 14-20, teach the reverse-discharge sensor S1 to perform that function.

In the earlier Official Action, the Examiner indicated that the claims recited allowable subject matter and would be in condition for allowance once the rejections indicated by 35 U.S.C. § 112 were addressed and overcome. Applicants respectfully submit that those rejections have been addressed and overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the above application is respectfully sought.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Lawrence A. Stahl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 30,110

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LAS:eyw

DC\_MAIN 203370v1